



Napoleonic Scholarship

The Journal of the International Napoleonic Society

No.9

December 2018



J. David Markham
President

Wayne Hanley
Editor-in-Chief

Illustrations



Front Cover:

Bronze and Carara marble 2nd Empire clock showing Napoleon the night before the Battle of Wagram. From the J. David Markham Collection.



Back Cover:

Snuffbox (ca. 1809-1821) of horn, wood, ivory and brass. Painting on a hinged lid of Napoleon resting on a chair with an Imperial Eagle the evening before the Battle of Wagram. The reverse has a hand painted imperial 'N' and the inscription 'Wagram 1809.' From the J. David Markham Collection.

Article Illustrations: Print images are from the J. David Markham Collection. The other images and maps were provided by the authors. Images from Dr. Hochel's article are provided with permission from Mgr. Marta Pavlíková, National Heritage Institute, Czech Republic.



Napoleonic Scholarship

THE JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL NAPOLEONIC SOCIETY

J. DAVID MARKHAM, PRESIDENT

WAYNE HANLEY, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

EDNA MARKHAM, PRODUCTION EDITOR

Editorial Review Committee

Rafe Blaufarb

Director, Institute on Napoleon and the French Revolution at Florida State University

John G. Gallaher

Professor Emeritus, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville,
Chevalier dans l'Ordre des Palmes Académiques

Alex Grab

Professor of History, University of Maine

Romain Buclon

Université Pierre Mendès-France

Maureen C. MacLeod

Assistant Professor of History, Mercy College

Wayne Hanley

Editor-in-Chief and Professor of History, West Chester University

J. David Markham

President, International Napoleonic Society,
Chevalier dans l'Ordre des Palmes Académiques

Napoleonic Scholarship is a production of the International Napoleonic Society.

For further information on the INS, contact J. David Markham, 81 Navy Wharf Court, Suite 3315, Toronto, ON M5V 3S2, CANADA, Phone: (416) 342-8081, Fax: (416) 368-2887

Email: inspresident@icloud.com Web: www.napoleonicsociety.com

The INS is registered with and recognized by the government of Canada.

All rights reserved. ©2019 The International Napoleonic Society.

Scholars from the following countries are Fellows of our Society:

 Australia	 Hungary	 Palestine
 Austria	 India	 Panama
 Belarus	 Ireland	 Portugal
 Belgium	 Israel	 Poland
 Bulgaria	 Italy	 Romania
 Canada	 Kazakhstan	 Russia
 Chile	 Lebanon	 Slovakia
 Columbia	 Luxembourg	 South Africa
 Cuba	 Malta	 Spain
 Czech Republic	 Mexico	 Sweden
 Egypt	 Monaco	 Switzerland
 France	 Mongolia	 Syria
 Georgia	 Netherlands	 United Kingdom
 Germany	 Pakistan	 United States

Contents

Illustrations	2
International Napoleonic Society Aims and Goals.....	6
Message from the President.....	7
Message from the Editor-in-Chief.....	8
List of Contributors	10

Articles

William L. Chew III, <i>Napoleon and Germany: Louisa of Prussia Revisited</i>	13
Susan P. Connor, <i>The Agony and the Ecstasy: Marie Louise and The Birth of the King of Rome</i>	26
Attila Réfi, <i>A Career with an Unfair Ending: The Life and Military Activity of the Austrian Lieutenant General Baron Joseph Meskó de Felsőkubin (1762-1815)</i>	35
Marian Hochel, <i>Napoleonic Memorabilia as the Mediator of Historical Memory in Chateau Collections in Lands of the Bohemian Crown</i>	51
Wayne Hanley, <i>Napoleon and the Romantics: From Hero to Villain</i>	78
Karl Jakob Skarstein, <i>Napoleon's Forgotten Victory: Mondovi (21 April 1796)</i>	90
T. E. Crowdy, <i>The Marengo Spy: Military Espionage in Napoleon's Second Italian Campaign</i>	104
Dennis W. Potts, <i>Quatre Bras: Dutch Courage Saves the Day</i>	118
Balázs Lázár, <i>Army Recruitment in the Kingdom of Hungary during the Napoleonic War: Reform Efforts and Failures</i>	130
István Nagy-Luttenberger, <i>Hungarian Generals of the French Wars: A Study of Military Merit and Social Mobility</i>	147
David Wright, <i>Württemberg Light Troops: Their Tactical Deployment in the 1809 Campaign Against Austria</i>	169
Matej Čapo, <i>The Occupation of Bratislava in 1809</i>	191
Jaromír Kovárník, <i>Mass Graves of the Battle of Znojmo/Znaim 1809</i>	209
Nicholas Stark, <i>Masters in Their Own Country: Approaching Ireland in the Napoleonic System, 1796-1815</i>	241

Andrzej Kosim, <i>Shattered Illusions: The Secret Mission of Lieutenant-colonel Björnstjerna to Napoleon in 1809</i>	253
Alasdair White, <i>Post-Napoleonic Political Unrest and the Formation of the State of Belgium 1813-1850: A Conceptual Approach</i>	264
William L. Chew III, <i>Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna and the Abolition of the Slave Trade</i>	271
Paul L. Dawson. <i>Waterloo: The Truth at Last. Why Napoleon Lost the Great Battle, A review by Alasdair White.</i>	284
Historic Documents	288
Napoleon's Administration of the Kingdom of Italy: Decree of 28 June 1805	289
Order of the Day and News from Tyrol 13 November 1805.....	292
Armistice 6 December 1805 and Proclamation 3 December 1805	299
Official News 1806 and 1807.....	306
Prelude to Eylau: Bennigsen's Report to the Czar 31 January 1807	323
Napoleon's Divorce Law 15 December 1809	330
The Campaign of 1809: 26 th Bulletin 9 July 1809 and Armistice 12 July 1809.....	341
Napoleon's Marriage to Marie Louise: Bulletin of Laws 25 March 1810.....	349
<i>La Belle Assemblée</i> 1810 – 1814	384
Call for Articles	422
INS Congresses	424
Instructions to Authors.....	426

Hungarian Generals of the French Wars: A Study of Military Merit and Social Mobility

by István Nagy-Luttenberger

During the long period of war from 1787, the beginning of the war against the Turks (1787-1791) to the end of the French Wars in 1815 the military elite of the Habsburg Monarchy consisted of 1,243 persons of which 875 served as active generals.¹ At this moment 214 persons of the active generals can be considered as Hungarians that means coming from the lands of St. Stephen's Crown (Hungarian Kingdom, Croatian Kingdom, Grand Duchy of Transylvania, Military Border).² This number corresponds to almost 25 percent of the group, making up a remarkable proportion.

Lacking the modern national identity, the contemporary description of "Hungarian" does not mean pure Hungarian nationality but as a political identity it was bound to the Hungarian Kingdom and her St. Stephen's Crown. The contemporary term of Hungary consisted of the practicably twin kingdom of Croatia and Hungary (including Slavonia with mixed status between the "twins" and Banat, incorporated into the Hungarian Kingdom in 1772) but in a broader meaning it united the Grand Duchy of Transylvania and the Military Border as integral parts of the old

Hungarian Kingdom. That lands theoretically embraced the lands of St. Stephen's Crown, the most important political tradition dated from the time of state founder St. Stephan I. The privileged (and theoretically all the) inhabitants of that lands formed the political nation of Hungary. According to the contemporary thoughts in my research, I use the term Hungarian as the members of the political nation regardless the nationality. Among the generals we can find representatives of almost all nations of the Carpathian Basin: Germans, Slovaks, Croatians, Serbs, Romanians and naturally Hungarians (Magyars). The definition of "Hungarian" is interpreted in the research as:

- born in the territories of the Hungarian Kingdom, Croatian Kingdom, *Temeswarer Banat* (until 1772), Grand Duchy of Transylvania and the Military Border
- born outside of the above-mentioned lands but considered himself as Hungarian or a member of the political nation of Hungary
- descendant of a known Hungarian family

¹ About the war, see Oskar Criste, *Kriege unter Joseph II* (Wien, 1904). For the military events of the wars see Adolf von Hosetzky, *Kriegsgeschichtliche Übersicht der wichtigsten Feldzüge in Europa seit 1792* (Wien, 1905); and

Gunther E. Rothenberg, *The Napoleonic Wars* (London, 1999).

² For the institution of the military border, see Gunther E. Rothenberg, *The Military Border in Croatia. A Study of an Imperial Institution* (Chicago-London 1966).

Among the generals there are a few well known Hungarians (f. e. Alvinczy, Kray, Davidovich, Sztáray, Gyulai) but it is far lesser-known that some familiar names were also hiding Hungarian generals (f. e. Zach, Melas, Zechenter).

The essential aim of the study is to determine the role of the Hungarians among the military leaders of the Empire, to compare their military career and effort and their social background to representatives of other parts of the Habsburg Monarchy using comparative methods. Concerning the Hungarian generals, the goal is to perform deeper analysis of the internal composition in consideration of the society.

The basic sources of the research are the official records of the military administration kept by the Aulic War Council, called *Stabsbücher* (Staff Records).³ It was a register of service and payment of the persons of the Imperial-Royal Army⁴ serving outside of the military units. It is divided into several parts such as generals (serving and non-serving), General Staff, Engineer Corps, officers in special duties (i.e. place officers) administrative personals etc. The *Stabsbücher* contains all the military serving generals exclusive the

Noble Guards of the Court. As the official records of service, all the decisions by the ruler or by the Aulic War Council were accurately recorded in the *Stabsbücher*. The received payment amounts are showing also that the general was in peace or even in peace duty. Other important sources are the *Pensionsprotokolle* (Pension Records).⁵ The change of the personal registry in 1820 resulted in these very useful protocols regarding the generals in pension living in 1820. Although the protocols started in 1820 but these contain the full service data besides the personal information. The important source of the family status and the relationship between the different generations is the *Heiratskautionen*.⁶ These protocols contain data about the caution money (or the fact of the exemption) of every marriage regarding the officers of the army.

The most important primary sources for the military service before the rank of general are the *Musterlisten und Standestabellen* (Muster Rolls and Strength Reports from the middle of the 18th century up to 1820).⁷ The collection of more than 12,000 boxes of files is a great possibility to find extensive details of the soldiers of the army. Not only the muster rolls but the transfer files between units of

³ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv, Versorgungsunterlagen, *Stabsbücher*.

⁴ The official designation of the army of the Habsburg Monarchy was "Imperial until 1745, between 1745 and 1889 "Imperial-Royal" after 1889 "Imperial and Royal). Alphons Freiherr von Wrede, *Geschichte der k. und k. Wehrmacht*, vol. 1 (Wien, 1898), 16. For the basic military organizational matters of the Habsburg Monarchy, see the whole series (volumes 1-4).

⁵ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv, Versorgungsunterlagen, *Pensionsprotokolle der Offiziere, Beamten, Parteien, Witwen und Waisen, Jüngere Reihe*; mainly the book *Generale I*.

⁶ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv, Versorgungsunterlagen, *Heiratskautionen*.

⁷ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv, Personalunterlagen, *Musterlisten und Standestabellen*.

the army are very useful. The monthly strength reports contain the personal changes of the units and are useful to fill the missing data of the military career. Whereas the collection is huge, it is far from being full. There are gaps in the files especially before 1800. In some cases, other sources are needed because the lack of the files. The *Vormerkprotokolle* (Records of the Promotions) was the register of the date of the rank.⁸ Not only the date of the actual promotion but the unit are also noted, and this data is very useful addition to the muster rolls, which is not always the most accurate but sometimes the only available data. Additionally, many other archival files were used such as the *Alte Feldakten* (Old Field Files), *Wiener Hofkriegsrat Hauptreihe* (main sequence of the Aulic War Council in Vienna), Ternions (Personal Files of Military Individuals) and others.⁹

Of course, the secondary sources, hundreds of books and journal articles are also to be processed. The most important books are the official publications (*Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift*, *Schematismus*, *Staff Studies*) and the regimental histories. In the time of the Austro-Hungarian Empire great emphasis was placed on the military history of the Imperial-Royal army to strengthen the esprit de corps of the whole army and the units too. Every regiment let its history to be researched and published and the “face of the regiment”

was shaped according to the heroes of the past. The authors of the old regimental histories could use the regimental files, which were lost during the time after.

The term of composite state can be used for the Hungarian Kingdom itself. Nonetheless, the official relationship between the Hungarian (and Croatian) Kingdom and the Grand Duchy of Transylvania once again ceased in 1791 as the United Chancellery was newly divided but the unofficial relationships and the deep personal interdigitation has still held a strong togetherness. In the military matters that phenomenon can be observed as the *General Commando* in Buda performed a coordination of the other four General Commandos (Agram/Zagreb, Peterwardein, Temeschwar, Hermannstadt) of the Carpathian Basin.¹⁰

If the Hungarian Kingdom was itself a composite state, the Habsburg Monarchy¹¹ can be described as a morefold composite state. Several group of lands (Inner Austria: Styria, Carinthia, Krain, Austrian Littoral, Lower Austria: Upper and Lower Austria, Bohemia: Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Italian possessions, Austrian Netherlands) had historical tradition of togetherness and the government followed that tradition as the governing offices acted by that groups. The military organization was only slightly affected by the group of

⁸ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv, Zentralstellen, Wiener Hofkriegsrat, Sonderreihen, Bestellungen und Vormerkprotokolle, Buch 12 to 16.

⁹ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv, Feldakten, Alte Feldakten.

¹⁰ Administrative territorial military command.

¹¹ For a modern analysis from the viewpoint of the new military history, see Michael Hochedlinger, *Austria's Wars of Emergence, War, State and Society in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1683-1797* (London, 2003).

lands. The Hungarian infantry regiments had their kind of own different uniforms and the recruiting system remained divided as the conscription system was introduced in 1771/1781, but only in the Bohemian, Austrian groups and in Galicia. The unification of the military system was much more advanced than the monetary or the administrative issues.

The composition of the generals of the Imperial-Royal Army was also affected by the morefold composite state of the Habsburg Monarchy. The ruler of the Monarchy was not only the ruler of the kingdoms, duchies or other territories of the Monarchy but also the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, a “more than nothing but less than something” state. The Empire had an own constitution, but the lands of the Empire were almost fully independent from each other or from the Emperor. Prussia as the biggest opposition of the Habsburg Monarchy had great influence in the Empire, but the bigger states (such as Bavaria or Saxony) and the middle-sized lands (such as Baden) acted as independent powers in the international politics. In the military matters, however, the Imperial-Royal Army played an important role in the Empire. Lesser states or landlords looked to the emperor as the protector against aggressive bigger neighbors and let the Emperor recruit in their lands and often themselves undertook military service in the Army of the Emperor and whole military dynasties developed such as Schwarzenberg, Hohenzollern, Hohenlohe, Oranien, Württemberg, Anhalt, Nassau, Sachsen. The Italian and Austrian Dutch

(from Austrian Netherlands) elements also gladly served the Emperor as the opportunity for elevation but even the pure military service had great prestige.

In the Imperial-Royal army four grades of the general's rank were in use. The lowest rank was the *Generalmajor* usually commanding a brigade (or middle-sized forts), therefore occasionally called *Brigadier*. On the tactical side of the fighting method of the army the brigade commanders had crucial role because the direct tactical controls were not possible above this level. The second rank was the *Feldmarschall Lieutenant*. The standard command of this rank was a division (earlier it was named as column) consisting of one to three brigades. On the battlefield the divisions (and columns) acted as large tactical units and elements of the operation and battle planning. The older or not physically fit *Feldmarschall Lieutenants* often commanded the larger forts of the Monarchy or even smaller *Generalcommandos*. The next grade was the *General der Kavallerie* (for the cavalry commanders) and *Feldzeugmeister* (for other commanders). During wartime these generals commanded a corps or even an independent army. The largest armies were often commanded by that type of generals. As administrative commands the largest and most reputed *Generalcommandos* or important branches such as the *Genie Corps* or even the *Hofkriegsrat* was led by a *General der Kavallerie* or a *Feldzeugmeister*. The top of the generals' rank was the *Feldmarschall*. In the Era of the French Wars a *Feldmarschall* rarely commanded an

army. Usually old or rather honorary than able generals wore this rank. Hadik, Clerfayt, Archduke Charles and Schwarzenberg commanded armies in the field wearing this rank the others served in administrative (sometimes in honorary) commands. "Above" the top of the authorized ranks, a new designation appeared as Archduke Charles appointed to *Generalissimus*.¹² It was not a regular rank rather than a denomination of a supreme commander of the military matters of the whole Habsburg Monarchy. After his resigning in 1809 the designation of *Generalissimus* disappeared.

The military elite of the Habsburg Monarchy consisted of three major parts: first, naturally from the territories of the Monarchy itself, second, from the Holy Roman Empire, third, from abroad. The French element was particularly high among the generals mostly from the western side of France. The husband of Maria Theresia, *Franz* of Lorraine attracted French nobles from Lorraine and Alsace to serve him as the Holy Roman Emperor. Dozens of these officers reached the rank of generals in the final third of the 18th century. The other source of the officers and generals were the mercenary families. In the European warfare from the 15th century on the mercenaries played increasingly important role until the French Revolution. Perhaps the most known mercenary warlord was Feldmarschall Lacy whose father had

served the Tsar, but the son has chosen the Imperial-Royal army.

The era of the French Wars brought a lesser known effect on the military matters, the transformation of the military elites of the states. That impact can be noticed in every major armies of Europe. The phenomenon of mercenary warlords almost totally faded out and only slightly remained in being as hiring experts mostly by less developed armies. The other important change that the high-born aristocracy lost ground and the role of the ability became much more important. That phenomenon was not only bound to the French Revolution because Count Hadik was a member of a pure noble and not even wealthy family, but he was able to reach the highest rank and position of the Imperial-Royal Army well before the French Revolution just through his personal abilities.

The main beneficiaries of the two tendencies were the officers born inside the Monarchy. As the warlords from the Holy Roman Empire and the mercenaries faded out, their places were occupied by the able indigenous officers. Naturally, that process was particularly slow, and it was far from finished by 1815. The evolution of the transformation of the military elite developed from below beginning from the officers ranks up to the generals. The multiple crisis of high field commands let some pure noble born generals to command great field armies such as Melas, Kray, Alvinczy, Frimont or Mack but in the case

¹² About Archduke Charles see Gunther E. Rothenberg, *Napoleon's Great Adversaries: The*

Archduke Charles and the Austrian Army, 1792-1814 (Chalford, 2007).

of the administrative commands that process remained quite slow. That dichotomy can be observed especially in the commander of most reputed Viennese General Commando, where until 1830 only born aristocrats were put in command and between 1774 and 1820 for 35 years landlords from the Holy Roman Empire have been commanding it.

Therefore, in my research I examined the basic personal data (name, born, death), the family and social background and mobility, the military education, the whole military career and the military merit focusing on the military branch service, the command positions and the Military Maria Theresia Order. The statistic and geographical works under Joseph II and the published contemporary statistical descriptions give excellent chance to conduct comparative studies.

The generals were in the focus of certain researches of historians or enthusiasts several times before but in contrast to the case of the generals of France,¹³ Prussia,¹⁴ Russia¹⁵ and some lesser German states,¹⁶ the results were neither full nor based on primary sources or even never finished or

published. Therefore, the academic interest is well-founded.

The first systematic research of the generals of the Habsburg and Austro-Hungarian Monarchy was conducted in the Kriegsarchiv before the First World War: the so-called Generalsbücher (book of generals) are available as manuscript in the Kriegsarchiv.¹⁷ The books are collections of the promotion date, name and the last position before the promotion to general and sometimes the death date. The main problem of the books is that neither the name nor the last position is not fully researched, and the other data contain pretty much inaccuracy or even erratum. For example, according to the contemporary data Jacob Robert Graf Nugent von Westmeath died exactly ten years earlier than mentioned in the Generalsbuch. The genealogy was not in the focus of the research and sometimes the data of the family members are intermingled. The other problem that neither the author(s) nor the sources of the research are known.

More than a decade ago the Kriegsarchiv launched a wide scale research of the generals of the Habsburg Monarchy.¹⁸ The

¹³ Georges Six, *Dictionnaire biographique des généraux et amiraux français de la Révolution et de l'Empire: 1792-1814* (Paris, 1934).

¹⁴ Kurt von Priesdorff, *Soldatisches Führertum* (Hamburg, 1937-1942).

¹⁵ Alexander Mikaberidze, *The Russian Officer Corps of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars 1792-1815* (New York, 2005).

¹⁶ Tobias Friedrich Kroeger, *Zwischen eigenstaatlicher Souveränität und napoleonischem Imperialismus: Das bayerische Offizierskorps 1799-1815* (München, 2013); and Uta Lerche,

“Frühneuzeitlicher Staat und militärische Führung. Die pfälzbayerische Generalität unter Karl Theodor und Max IV. (I.) Joseph 1778-1815,” doctoral dissertation, Regensburg, 2013.

¹⁷ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv, Behelf; AB 339-3-39; Leesaalbehelf 1/1 (until 1815) and 1/2 (from 1815).

¹⁸ Link as follows:
http://www.oesta.gv.at/site/cob_18844/currentpage_0/6647/default.aspx (access on 27. 08. 2018).

ambitious project covered more than 4000 generals from the time between 1618 and 1815 an intended to publish a biographical lexicon. The project aimed at the widest scale collection of data from the personal and military service data to the portraits and the archival legacy. It would have been the most exhaustive biographical research of the French Wars Era, but, unfortunately, the project was never finished. Michael Hochedlinger laid down the basic methods, aims and sources of the project in a very valuable study¹⁹ but only a list of names published by Antonio Schmidt-Brentano as the starting point of the research.²⁰ His lists cover the full timeline of the Habsburg and Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The main merit of the list are the genealogical results. Extensive researches of the mainly old aristocratic families benefited in a great detail and accurate identification of high number of generals. The list proved to be quite accurate but not in every aspect as some inaccuracy of its main sources, the Generalsbücher remained uncorrected. The other imperfection is the lack of the list of the used sources. It is clear that the Stabsbücher were not used and only a

restricted range of primary sources were processed.

Far the best research on the Imperial-Royal generals came from Leopold Kudrna with biographical essays by Digby Smith published on The Napoleon Series in 2008.²¹ It covers the years between 1792 and 1815 and contains 1,152 persons. The individual biographies contain the personal and family data, the military service (promotions, command and office posts, field service), the social background and the orders (decorations and honorary appointments) and the sources of each general. The personal records are full of valuable data but far from fully researched as only a restricted scale of primary sources were used. This fantastic database is a great mine of the contemporary *Schematismus* data and hundreds of mainly secondary sources. The authors had no intention to complete the research as they explained, their “biographical dictionary is designed to provide researchers a beginning point for further studies.”

The Hungarian researchers focused only marginally on our Era. The generals of the

¹⁹ Michael Hochedlinger, *Des Kaisers Generale. Bibliographische und quellenkundliche Anmerkungen zur Erforschung militärischer Eliten in der frühneuzeitlichen Habsburgermonarchie*. <http://www.oesta.gv.at/DocView.axd?CobId=18384> (access on 31. 08. 2018.); see also: Michael Hochedlinger, Quellen zum kaiserlichen bzw. k. k. Kriegswesen, in *Quellenkunde der Habsburgermonarchie (16–18. Jahrhundert)*. Josef Pauser, Martin Scheutz, and Thomas Winkelbauer, eds., (Wien, 2004), 162-81.

²⁰ Schmidt-Brantano, Antonio, *Die k. k. bzw. k. u. k. Generalität 1816-1918*. http://www.oesta.gv.at/Docs/2007/6/5/K_k_%20bz

w_%20k_u_k_%20Generale%201816-1918.pdf (access on 31. 08. 2018); and Antonio Schmidt-Brantano, *Kaiserliche und k.k. Generale (1618-1815)*.

http://www.oesta.gv.at/Docs/2006/11/20/Kaiserliche%20bzw%20k_%20k_%20Generale%201618-1815%20_Liste.pdf (access on 31. 08. 2018).

²¹ Leopold Kudrna (with biographical essays by Digby Smith), *Biographical Dictionary of all Austrian Generals during the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars 1792-1815*. http://napoleon-series.org/research/biographies/Austria/AustrianGenerals/c_AustrianGeneralsIntro.html (access on 31. 08. 2108).

two Freedom Fights of Rákóczi²² and in 1848-49²³ and of the First World War,²⁴ or the officers of the dualism²⁵ are researched and published or the research is still in progress. The first important steps were also taken regarding the 18th century Hungarian generals.²⁶ Besides there is still living in the eyes of the Hungarian society an unjust image about the disregard of the Hungarian officers and generals within the Imperial-Royal army. Fortunately, in recent times the interest is seemingly growing.²⁷

The basic hypothesis: The Hungarian generals, consisted a quarter of the generals of the army. This rate matches the scale of the number of inhabitants of each part of the Monarchy (naturally except the generals born in foreign countries). The great majority of the generals were born as noble and as Roman Catholic. The elevation of the social status, the social mobility (from own effort or facilitated by family members) is quite significant. Their military effort matches their ratio. Some of them reached and became incorporated

into the highest military elite of the Monarchy.

As it was mentioned above the group wearing the rank of a general consisted of 1243 persons, but 368 generals never served even one day as general and only wore the title. They can be divided into different groups. Most of them were so-called “*titulár*” or “*ad honores*” generals pensioned as colonel with the honorary title of *Generalmajor*. Some French emigrants, mostly old generals received the rank of an Imperial-Royal general as a basis of a kind of civil list pension. The most interesting group is the Italian generals’ who passed over to Imperial-Royal service in 1814 as each of them had been fighting against Austria for two decades before.

The 875 active serving generals form the basis of my research. In the case of 868 generals the birth is clear but the provenance of only 7 of them is still somewhat unclear. There are 214 generals with origin from the lands of St. Stephen’s Crown. To simplify the terminology, I call

²² Kálmán Mészáros, *II. Rákóczi Ferenc tábornokai és brigadérosai. A kuruc katonai felső vezetés létrejötte és hierarchiája, 1703–1711* (Budapest, 2006); and Gusztáv Heckenast, *Ki kicsoda a Rákóczi-szabadságharcban? Életrajzi adattár* (Budapest, 2005).

²³ Gábor, Bona *Tábornokok és törzstisztek az 1848/49. évi szabadságharcban* (Miskolc, 2015).

²⁴ Tibor, Balla *A Nagy Háború osztrák–magyar tábornokai. Tábornagyok, vezérezredek, gyalogsági és lovassági tábornokok, tábornagyok* (Budapest, 2010); and Gábor Kiss, *Tábornokok a Magyar Királyi Honvédségben 1768-1814*. H. n. (Budapest, 2016).

²⁵ István Deák, *Beyond Nationalism: A Social and Political History of the Habsburg Officer Corps, 1848-1918* (New York, 1990).

²⁶ József Zachar, *Habsburg-uralom, állandó hadsereg és magyarság 1683–1792* (Budapest, 2004).

²⁷ Balázs Lázár, *Krajovai és topolyai báró Kray Pál tábornagy katonai pályája* (Budapest, 2013); Attila Réfi, *A császári-királyi huszárság törzstiszti kara a francia forradalmi és a napóleoni háborúk korában (1792–1815)* (Budapest, 2014); Attila Réfi, *A császári-királyi ulánuszrezdek törzstisztei a francia háborúk idején (1792-1815)*, *Életrajzi lexikon* (Pápa, 2016); Attila Réfi, *Császári-királyi karabélyos és vértis törzstisztek a francia háborúk idején (1792-1815)*, *Életrajzi lexikon*. I-II. Kötet (Pápa, 2015-2018); István, Nagy-L, *A császári-királyi hadsereg 1765-1815, Szervezettörténet és létszámviszonyok* (Pápa, 2013).

them Hungarian but not as nationality rather as members of the political nation of Hungary.

From the 875 serving generals of the French Wars, according to the latest results 321 persons came from outside of the Habsburg monarchy, which means roughly third (37 percent) of all the generals.²⁸ 150 of them had their origin in the Holy Roman Empire, 58 in Italy, and 51 in France as the three main source of the military elite from abroad but almost all European lands are represented such as Spain, Russia, Sweden, Swiss, Ireland and much more.

At the beginning point of the research, the start of the 1788 military year (1 November 1787) 52 (38 percent) of the 138 generals were foreigner in the Habsburg Monarchy and from the 86 indigenous generals, and 23 (17 percent of total and 27 percent of indigenous) can be considered to be Hungarian. The remaining 737 generals were promoted during the times of the French Wars and 269 of them (36 percent) were foreigner, which is only a slight decrease, but the 191 Hungarian generals promoted (26 percent) is a remarkable increase. The decrease of the foreigners was not too spectacular, but it must be noticed

that among the officers' great number of foreigners served early in the examined period and served a potential source of recruiting generals.

Looking at the origin of the generals compared to the inhabitants of the lands, the dominance of the Hungarian Kingdom as origin is clear and the number of persons who came from the South Slav territories seems lower than expected. The totally militarized southern Border gave significant number of warriors to the army but the military elite of the Monarchy changed slowly. The officers of the Grenzer units regularized during the middle third of the 18th century reached the rank of a general by the last one and a half decade of the 18th century in larger quantity.

The identity of the Hungarian Political Nation was still intact by the end of the 18th century but the nationalism slowly started to impact on the national minorities of the Habsburg Monarchy. It is far from my topic to give details of this phenomenon, but it is important to point out the first signs of a new type of nationalism in the Carpathian Basin mostly among the Croatians, Serbs, Rumanians and Slovaks.

The Origins of the Hungarian Generals based on the Traditional Lands of St. Stephen's Crown	
<i>Region</i>	<i>Number of Generals</i>
Hungarian Kingdom	121
Croatian Kingdom	26
Transylvania	25
Temeswarer Banat	4

²⁸ The borders were calculated according to the date of the birth and to the beginning of the military service.

Slavonia	23
Outside of the land	15

One of the hardest tasks of my research is to determine the nationality of the individuals. The table shows an attempt to resolve the question of the nationality:

Question of Nationality				
	Number	Indigenous in Hungary (174 men)	Hungarian (216 men)	Total (875 men)
Hungarian	92	53%	43%	11%
Croatian	41	24%	19%	5%
German	27	15%	13%	3%
Serb	14	8%	7%	2%
Indigenous total	174	100%	81%	20%
German	21		10%	2%
Czech, Moravian	9		4%	1%
French	4		2%	<1%
Italian	4		2%	<1%
Spanish	2		1%	<1%
Foreigners total	40		19%	5%
			100%	25%

Even the Hungarian names and clear Hungarian origins could hide minorities. For example, General Máriássy was a descendant of an old Hungarian family, but he corresponded with his mother in Slovak language (even though she was a descendant of a Croatian family: Stanchich). The other direction is also frequent. General Wartensleben had origin in the Holy Roman Empire, but his mother was Klára Teleki Wartensleben and spoke Hungarian as mother tongue (thus his national identity also changed to Hungarian).

It is even harder to separate the different German groups. The German minority was

the 4th (fourth) largest in Hungary, but its role in the Hungarian society, economy, science and even in culture was much more important. The traditional German citizens of the royal cities (civitas) and noble-owned towns (oppidum) and the so-called Transylvanian Saxons played a significant role in the army too. Generals Hillinger, Kulnek, and the Scharlach brothers are the archetype of this group of solid Hungarian identity, and General Melas was a Saxon with Evangelical preachers in his family. The new immigrants of the Eighteenth Century make up the second group. The mass of the German settlers is well known, but the head-workers and craftsmen played also a crucial role. Generals Zach and

Zechenter were their most prominent representatives.

The most complex group, compounded the sons of officers and officials, had wide variants of identity. Not only Germans but Frenchmen, Spaniards, Italians, Moravians and Czech were also members of this party, represented by Generals Tige, Volkmann, Mohr, and the two Bechards (father and son). We can observe various ways of identity of these so-called *Tornister-Kinder*. Mohr served mostly as hussar developed some Hungarian identity but Tige earned

the official citizenship as so-called *indigenatus*. Most of them became loyal subject of the ruler as they have lost their original national identity and became so-called military families.

Other group is consisted of foreign aristocrat families who received huge lands and manors for their service during the 17th and 18th century. Some descendants of these families served the Emperor as soldiers: as Klebelsberg and the three Mittrowskys.

Troops of the Imperial-Royal Army Recruiting from Hungary in April 1792 ²⁹				
	present		ready for duty	
	number	ratio	number	ratio
Line Infantry Regiments	29,265	13%	26,278	13%
Garnisons Battailon	528	<1%	489	<1%
Hussar Regiments	15,604	7%	14,196	7%
Hungary and Transylvania	45,397	20%	40,963	20%
Grenzer Regiments	43,370	19%	40,914	20%
Lands of St. Stephen's Crown	88,767	38%	81,877	39%
<i>Imperial-Royal Army total</i>	230,654	100%	209,032	100%

Inhabitants of the Lands of St. Stephen's Crown (1804, hundred men) ³⁰		
<i>Nationality</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Hungarian	3,950	41%
Slovak	790	8%
Romanian	1,970	21%
Croatian and Serb	1,480	15%
German	890	9%
Ruthen	280	3%
Other	223	2%
Total	9,583	100%

²⁹ Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv, Feldakten, Alte Feldakten, Karton 3717, Haupt Stand und Dienst Tabelle, April 1792.

³⁰ Tamás Faragó, *Bevezetés a történeti demográfia*, vol. 1 (Budapest, 2011).

The comparative study of the nationality of the generals and the number of the nationalities of Hungary and the Imperial-Royal Army carries an important lesson. Only the Hungarian nationality approaches the ratio of the inhabitants and the ranks. The greatest difference can be observed in the case of the South Slav elements. The South Slavs composed of one

third of the Hungarian generals which is a remarkably low rate. This shows that the manpower of the Military Border was used up efficiently but the officers have just begun to reach the general's rank. It cannot be registered even one Romanian, Ruthen or other national minority among the generals.

Ratio of the Inhabitants, Soldiers and Generals				
	Inhabitants	Hungarian Generals	Approximate Ratio of the Imperial-Royal Army	Ratio from all the generals
Hungarian, Slovak	49%	53%	11%	11%
German	9%	16%	2%	3%
Croatian and Serb	15%	32%	19%	6%
Romanian	21%	0%	5%	0%
others	5%	0%	2%	0%
	100%	100%	39%	20%

The origin of that inequality lies in the high number of generals who came from outside of the Habsburg Monarchy. The great number of French and German elements are the legacy of the eighteenth-century practice and politics when nobles or even aristocrats of lesser German states served in the army of the Emperor who welcomed the loyal subjects and trusted them highly.

The internal composition of the Hungarian generals according to the ranks strengthens the impression of the transformation of the general's overall composition. From the 23 generals serving at the beginning point of the research there were 15 Hungarians and 8 foreigners. The highest ranked general, Feldmarschall Hadik was a born

Hungarian also as nationality. The seven *Feldmarschall Lieutenants* shows an entirely other picture. Four of them were foreigners (one German, one German/French, one Spaniard, one Moravian) but the other three had Hungarian nationality. From the 14 *Generalmajors* eight were Hungarians, one Croatian, one Serb, one German, and three foreigners (one, German, one Italian, one Moravian). The later promotions of these 23 generals were: three *Feldmarschall Lieutenant* promoted to *General der Kavallerie* (one Hungarian and three foreigners), one to *Feldzeugmeister* (foreigners), one *Generalmajor* to *Feldmarschall* (Alvinczy, Hungarian), one to *Feldzeugmeister* (foreigner), seven to *Feldmarschall Lieutenant* (all natives). The

majority of foreigners in higher rank is a remarkable fact. The foreigners reached higher rank in general.

The remaining 191 generals were promoted during the examined time. Looking at the highest serving rank until 1815, four of them elevated to *General der Kavallerie* and six to *Feldzeugmeister* (all natives), 55 to *Feldmarschall Lieutenant* (45 natives and 10 foreigners), 126 to *Generalmajor* (104 natives and 22 foreigners). There is a sharp contrast to the group of above as none of the foreigners in Hungary are in the group elevated to the highest ranks and not even one fifth of the generals were foreigners. That is the clearest sign of the fading out of the mercenary warlords.

The history of a corps cannot be cut into separated parts, most of the generals who served during the examined period started their career before it or served after it. They reached the top rank of their career not in every occasion during the French Wars Era. That is the cause that investigating the highest rank of the mentioned generals, higher ranks can be observed. On the top of the pyramid there are two *Feldmarschalls*. Just under them are 15 *General der Kavalleries* (4 foreigners, 6 Hungarians, 3 Germans and 1 Croatians and 1 Transylvanian Saxon) and 15 *Feldzeugmeister* (2 foreigners, 6 Hungarians, 4 Serbs, 1 Croatians, 1 German and 1 Transylvanian Saxon). In the middle stay 71 *Feldmarschall Lieutenants* (12 foreigners, 34 Hungarians, 13 Croatian, 6

German, 5 Serbs and 1 Transylvanian Saxon) and in the bottom the 111 *Generalmajors* (22 foreigners, 44 Hungarians, 26 Croatian, 9 German, 5 Serbs and 5 Transylvanian Saxons). If we compare the ratios to the 23 generals who served at the beginning of the period, the tendency of the slow evaporation of the foreigners, the quick emergence of the Hungarian and slow strengthening of the South Slav elements can be observed.

The most important persons of the military elite regarding the performance on the field and the efficiency in combat are the generals who led the army in campaigns and on the field of battle because not all the generals conducted field service. A not negligible part of them served only in off-field duty commanding fortresses of the homeland or troops in the hinterland and rear areas during wartime. Usually the older or not physically fit enough generals kept away from the exertions of a campaign. Of course, sometimes the out-of-favor generals were removed from field commands and were put to a “forgotten” edge of the Monarchy in an obscure duty. Perhaps one of the most important and most blameful example is the dismissal of General Mayer in 1809 who elaborated a good plan against the scattered forces of Napoleon, and he was removed in the eve of the war against Napoleon by the adversaries of Archduke Charles in the court and he was placed to Brod to command that small fortress.

Career Characteristics of Hungarian Generals						
	highest rank earned	highest rank until 1815	highest rank in service	highest rank in field	rank in 1787	promotions during the period
FM	2	2	2	1	1	1
FZM/GdK	30	15	12	9		15
FML	71	65	57	44	8	57
GM	111	132	143	122	14	118
Total	214	214	214	176	23	191

From the 214 serving Hungarian generals 38 never took a field command as general. From the 174 field serving generals the highest ranked was Hadik who led the main army in 1788 as *Feldmarschall*. Eight *Feldzeugmeister* (natives: Alvinczy, Ignaz Gyulai, Kray, Sztáray, Simbschen, Davidovich, Duka; foreigners: Joseph Anton Mittrowsky) and one *General der Kavallerie* (Melas, a Transylvanian Saxon) commanded corps' and field armies. The greatest task was given to *Feldzeugmeister* Kray who commanded the main army in the Danube in 1800 but *Feldzeugmeister* Alvinczy played crucial role in the 1796 and 1797 in the Italian Campaign. As *Feldmarschall Lieutenant* 44 generals and all the above mentioned and later promoted generals commanded divisions or sometimes corps of a field army. It is important to highlight general Kray again who in 1799 as *Feldmarschall Lieutenant* took over the interim command of the army in Italy as the oldest *Feldmarschall Lieutenant* just before the great French attack started. He was able to maneuver his troops to tackle the French attack and to repel the enemy. The French army retreated in disorder when Suvorov took command and invaded North Italy, but the

victory led to the conquest of important territories was earned by *Feldmarschall Lieutenant* Kray. Besides the 122 generals whose top rank was *Generalmajor*, 40 of *Feldmarschall Lieutenants* and 7 of *Feldzeugmeisters* and one *General der Kavallerie* served on the field as *Generalmajor* as well.

The next important, as it could be called myth-buster topic of the analysis is the military arm and branch background of the generals. The common trope identifies the Hungarian soldiers as hussars. The Hungarian light cavalry traditions and the world-wide success of the Hussar branch overshadowed the fact that even from the lands of the St. Stephen's Crown, exclusive the grenzers, the two third of the enlisted soldiers were infantryman. Inclusive the grenzers the ratio of the hussars balanced between 15 and 20 percent during the French Wars' Era. The national composition of the Hungarian generals and the mentioned ratio of troops adumbrates that the trope once again covers a false stereotype.

By the end of the Seventeenth Century, the military leaders of the Habsburg Monarchy decided to integrate the Hungarian soldiers

into the Imperial army. The process started in 1688 with the foundation the first hussar regiments and also the Hungarian infantry soon appeared as regular units. During the first third of the Eighteenth Century, the number of Hussars remained dominant, but during the Austrian War of Succession, the known pledge of the Hungarian Diet six new regular infantry regiments were formed. After a successful debut of the greater masses of Hungarian infantry in the middle of the Eighteenth Century, the large number of infantry parallel to the need of growing the number of the army, they became integral part of the Imperial-Royal army. The other component of the growing number of infantry was the regularization of the Military Border units. The growing number of inhabitants and the weakening of the Turkish threat allowed the forming of regular units of the army from the irregular masses of soldiers and let them take part in the wars of the European battlefields.

The about 40 regiments from the lands of St. Stephen's Crown needed hundreds of officers. The need of good officers was so high that high number of foreign officers were employed in these regiments. The education of Hungarian officers was on purpose of the military leaders of the

Monarchy. As Emperor-King Franz II stated: "It's better for them to civilize in German regiments"³¹ and a royal council resolved that sons of Hungarian officers are to be recruited to the military academy.³² By the end of the Eighteenth Century, high ranked staff officers and promising other officers were ready not only in the hussar regiments but also in the infantry to be promoted to generals. Some of them had high educational background in the Engineer Academy and others were excellent troop officers to lead brigades and divisions. In the last Turkish War between 1788 and 1791 the Hungarian troops did their bit in great number. The raiding fighting method of the Turks needed a lot of light troops and able brave officers with local geographical knowledge. The grenzers raised twice a number of soldiers as usual and the promotions followed these circumstances. After the Turkish War the long French Wars claimed a lot of generals because the generals of the times of Maria Theresia and Joseph II got older and even more unable to cope with the requirements of the French changes of warfare. The change of generation was quite spectacular during the War of the 2nd Coalition, as the army commanders and almost all the corps commanders were new.

³¹ Elemér Mályusz, *Sándor Lipót főherceg nádor iratai 1790–1795* (Budapest, 1926), 545.

³² *Diarium Comitiorum Regni Hungariae ... Anni 1792* (Buda, 1792), 101.

The Military Branch Background of the Generals from the Lands of St. Stephen's Crown ³³						
	Hungarian	German ³⁴	South Slav ³⁵	native	foreigner	total
Line infantry	29	13	2	44	19	63
Grenzers	7	3	40	50	5	55
Hussar	34	4	4	42	4	46
Technical, engineer	8		1	9	4	13
Cuirassier	4	1		5	4	9
Dragoon	2	3	1	6		6
Chevauxleger	2	1		3	1	4
Ulan	1			1		1
General staff		2	5	7		7
Artillery	1		1	2	1	3
Insurrection ³⁶	2		1	3		3
Noble Garde	1			1		1
Other	1			1	2	3
	92	27	55	174	40	214

The data shows us completely different facts than the trope. The importance of the hussar branch is clear, but the ratio is far from dominant. Among the natives of the lands of St. Stephen's Crown and even among the Hungarian nationalities the ratio of hussar generals was below 40 percent. Among the Hungarian nationalities the ratio of the cavalry background is somewhat higher than the number of cavalry troops but the parity between the cavalry and other branches and arms of the army shows the change of the Hungarian military culture. In the case of the South Slavs the dominance of the grenzers is clear but the relative high

number of the staff background is noticeable. It was a result of the meritocracy in the military academies introduced by Maria Theresia as the recruits of the academies were taken from the sons of able officers. The Germans of Hungary and Transylvania served in the infantry in great number and some of them were well educated militarily. The dominance of the infantry is also clear among the foreigners, but the high military education and the high prestige heavy cavalry was also popular.

We need to take a short look into the religious matters. As predicted, the clear majority, little more than three quarter of

³³ Some generals served in different arms or branches, but only the longest area of service of each general is included.

³⁴ Including Transylvanian Saxons.

³⁵ Including Croatians and Serbs.

³⁶ For the Hungarian insurrection see the most recent analysis, see László Tamás, "*Kövesd*

példákat vitéz eleidnek..." *A magyar nemesi felkelés a francia háborúk időszakában, különös tekintettel Székesfehérvár és Fejér vármegye szerepére* (Székesfehérvár, 2014).

the generals were Roman Catholic significantly overrepresenting the ratio of the Roman Catholic inhabitants. The ratio of the Evangelical generals roughly matches the ratio of Evangelical inhabitants but the ratio of the Reformed and the Orthodox generals remained exceptionally low. It can be declared that the Roman Catholics predominated at the Reformed and Orthodox faith's expense. The cause is different in the case of the two above mentioned faiths. The Hungarian Reformed nobility had a kick against

serving the Roman Catholic ruler in the age of the Carolina Resolution, the decree that hampered the Protestants to bear an office of the state or even a county. That phenomenon affected the Hungarian Reformed nobility so deeply that after the repeal of the decree in 1781, they remained passive in point of the military service. In the case of the Orthodox faith, their nobility was low in number and most of the Orthodox generals came from the ranks of the Military Border growing slowly in numbers.

Comparison of the Religion of the Generals to the Inhabitants of the Lands of St. Stephen's Crown			
	inhabitants	generals	
	percent	number	percent
Roman Catholic:	42%	164 men	76%
Evangelic:	8%	20 men	9%
Reformed:	16%	12 men	6%
Orthodox:	24%	14 men	7%
Greek Catholic	9%		
Unitarian	<1%	1 man	<1%
Jewish	1%		
Unknown:		3 men	1%
	100%	214 men	100%

The dominance of Roman Catholics did not mean that the possibility of reaching high military ranks exclusively belonged to them. From the two *Feldmarschalls* one, Alvinczy was Reformed coming from the typical Transylvanian Reformed poor nobility. Among the 30 *Feldzeugmeisters* and *General der Kavalleries* 20 were Roman Catholics, which is a lower ratio than among all the generals. Of the remining 10 generals, five were Evangelical, four were Orthodox, and one was Reformed. Of the 71

Feldmarschall Lieutenants, 56 were Roman Catholics (matching the overall ratio). The 5 Orthodox, 4 Reformeds, and the 4 Evangelicals are somewhat underrepresented in this group. The faith of two *Feldmarschall Lieutenants* are unknown. Looking at the *Generalmajors*, of the 111 generals, 87 were Roman Catholics, 11 were Evangelicals, 6 were Reformed, 5 were Orthodox, 1 was unitarian, and 1 was unknown. Analyzing the results of the research it can be stated that religious

consideration did not obstructed the military emergence. Although the military matters of the Habsburg Monarchy have been not so deeply influenced by the religious difficulties during the last centuries, by the end of the Eighteenth Century, the religion of the individual did not play any role in the military career.

Perhaps the most interesting topic can be considered the social status and the social mobility of the generals.³⁷ The common trope is in the case of the generals that the

highest military direction remained reserved to the “*Hoch- und Wohlgeborne*” high aristocracy and the officers were recruited from the middle class. Analyzing the social composition of the generals, these statements are more than misleading. The leading corps of the army appears to have been much more open than expected. Only 23 percent of the generals was born as aristocrats, almost two third as noble and even 14 percent came from below the nobility.

Social Mobility Chart ³⁸					
Status	As Born	Percentage	Remained	At Death	Percentage
Prince	2	1%	2	2	1%
Count	21	10%	21	28	13%
Baron	27	13%	27 (4 to count)	95	44%
Aristocratic	50	23%		125	57%
Noble	133	62%	73 (2 to count) (58 to baron)	89	43%
Burgher	9	4%	5 to baron 4 to noble		
Grenzer	22	10%	1 to count 9 to baron 12 to noble		
Non-Noble	31	14%			

Because of the military merit and somewhat according to other reasons (for

example elevation of father by office service) the social status of the generals

³⁷ For the social mobility see Karl Friedrich von Frank zu Döfering, *Alt-Österreichisches Adels-Lexikon*. Vol. 1 (Wien, 1928); Karl Friedrich von Frank, *Standeserhebungen und Gnadenakte für das Deutsche Reich [i. e. für das Heilige Römische Reich] und die Österreichischen Erblande bis 1806, sowie kaiserlich österreichische bis 1823, mit einigen Nachträgen zum "Alt-Österreichischen Adels-Lexikon" 1823-1918*, vols 1-5 (Schloss Senftenegg, 1967-7); Peter Frank-Döfering (s. a. r.), *Adels-*

Lexikon des österreichischen Kaisertums 1804-1918 (Wien, 1989); and Libri Regii (Official register of the Royal Chancellery) <https://archives.hungaricana.hu/hu/libriregii/> (access on 31. 08. 2018).

³⁸ The elevation in the Holy Roman Empire, in the Hereditary Lands (Austria, Bohemia etc.), in the Hungarian Kingdom and in the Grand Duchy of Transylvania are combined and the higher title is included.

elevated in case of 121 persons and 95 of them remained as born. The basic issue that every general who was born below the level of nobility earned at least nobility. One half of the non-noble born generals elevated to plain nobility but the others directly into the aristocracy as barons and one, general Karaiczay, to count. The mobility among the noble-born generals was still significantly high, 44 percent, as 58 of them received the title of a baron and two of them the title of count.

Among the aristocrat-born, mobility was rare. Only four barons emerged to count but each of them because of military merit. In the case of the born counts and princes no elevation can be registered. It shows that the upper bound of the military award was the title of count. Further elevation was almost impossible. In the Hungarian system of aristocratic ranks, the Prince were only the children of the rulers. Each Hungarian Prince, for example the Esterházy's received their rank in the Holy Roman Empire. The most important cause of the high mobility rate was the Military Maria Theresia Order. Each member of the Order was allowed to request the title of "freiherr" or baron. When the applicant was not noble, first he had to request the nobility and then the title of baron. In some occasions the member missed the opportunity, so the mobility could have been slightly higher.

The origin of the social mobility can be observed not from the general himself but from the family. In that case most of the elevation also came from military merit and only some from administrative service. The highest elevation from the later mentioned cause was General Pejachevich, whose father received the title of count. As the final judge of the social mobility topic, it can be emphasized that the misleading picture of the generals recruited from the aristocracy was not the origin but rather the outcome of the military merit and achievement.

As mentioned above, the origin of the high elevation rate was the Military Maria Theresia Order.³⁹ In the case of the 216 generals, we can register 105 grants of the Order for 87 generals, 2 Grand Crosses, 18 Commander's Crosses, and 85 Knight's Crosses. General Alvinczy received all three crosses; 16 generals received two; and 70 generals received one cross. Feldmarschall Andreas Hadik the elder received the Grand Cross, and General Melas, the Commander's Cross. The other 68 generals received the Knight's Cross alone. The ratio is particularly high, 40 percent of the generals received the most reputed medal of the contemporary Europe. This statistic speaks for itself as the measure of the military merit of the Hungarian generals. It could have been interesting to compare to other groups of the generals but that is an important task for the future.

³⁹ For the Military Maria Theresia Order, see Jaromir Hirtenfeld, *Der Militär-Maria-Theresien-Orden und seine Mitglieder*, vol. 1 (Wien, 1857).

The research of the Hungarian generals of the Imperial-Royal Army based on primary sources can be productive in two different regions. First and foremost, in military meaning covering the military career, achievement and the policy of the recruiting of generals by the highest political and military leaders of the Habsburg Monarchy. On the other hand, the internal composition of the generals, the social and religious background are important regarding the social history and the history of the elites not only from the viewpoint of Hungary and the successor states but from the entire Habsburg Monarchy as a morefold composite state and in wider viewpoint from the history of Central Europe.

The preliminary researches proved to be considerably inaccurate not principally in the detailed data but in separating the serving and non-serving generals, determining the real generals from the title wearing French emigrants and pensioned colonels and the old inactive pensioned generals and even the persons who left the Imperial-Royal army long before the beginning of the long wartime in 1787. The results of the research describe the real social and military attributes of the generals of the army and the military elite of the Habsburg Monarchy. The tropes relating the Hungarian soldiers and generals proved to be false and misleading underlining the never fading importance of the primer sources even if in case though the topic seems to be well researched, known or popular.